

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Upon entry of the above amendment, claims 7, 9, 11, and 12 will have been amended for consideration by the Examiner.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the outstanding objection and rejections of all the claims pending in the present application. Such action is respectfully requested and is believed to be appropriate and proper.

Initially, Applicants would like to express their appreciation to the Examiner for the detailed Official Action provided.

Turning to the merits of the action, the Examiner has objected to claims 7 and 19 as containing informalities therein. By the present amendment, Applicants amend claims 7 and 19 to eliminate the informalities. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this ground of objection.

The Examiner has rejected claims 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. By the present amendment, Applicants amend claim 7 to clarify the scope of the invention. In this regard, Applicants note that "scanned image data" refers to "facsimile apparatus scanning image data" previously mentioned in claim 7, and that "the received e-mail address" refers to "a controller configured to receive...an e-mail

address of the recipient” previously mentioned in claim 7. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this ground of rejection.

The Examiner has rejected claims 7, 8, and 11 under 35 U.S.C § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over CHEN (U.S. Patent No. 6,836,792) in view of TOYADA (U.S. Patent No. 5,881,233) and Beer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,864,676). The Examiner has rejected claims 9, 10, and 12 under 35 U.S.C § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over TADA (U.S. Patent No. 6,237,040) in view of TOYODA and BEER et al.

As noted above, Applicants have amended claims 7, 9, 11, and 12 for the Examiner’s consideration. Applicants respectfully traverse the above rejections based on pending claims 7-12, and will discuss the rejections with respect to the pending claims in the present application, as will be set forth hereinbelow. The amended claims clarify the subject matter recited in the canceled claims, but do not narrow the scope of the claims.

Applicants’ invention, as defined by the claims, generally relate to a communication control apparatus which comprises a first communicator configured to be connected to a network, and a second communicator configured to be connected to an Internet facsimile apparatus. The first communicator is a component of the communication control apparatus, and the second communicator is a component of the communication control apparatus. The Internet facsimile apparatus scans image data and transmits to a recipient, via the communication control apparatus, an e-mail to which the scanned image data is attached. The communication control apparatus further comprises a

controller which receives from the Internet facsimile apparatus, via the second communicator, an e-mail address of the recipient according to a SMTP protocol, converts the received e-mail address of the recipient into URL data, receives, from the receiving Internet facsimile apparatus via the second communicator, e-mail data directed to the recipient according to the SMTP protocol, converts the e-mail data into HTML data, and transmits to the recipient, via the first communicator, the HTML data without intervention of the recipient, based on the URL data according to a HTTP protocol. Claims 11-12 recite related methods.

With respect to the rejection of claims 7, 8, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), Applicants submit that CHAN relates to a method for providing add-on services responsive to an e-mail transferred via a distributed computer network. In CHEN, e-mail sender 102 commands e-mail front end 108 to transmit an e-mail to e-mail recipient 106, using a send command (col.1, lines 56-58). The transmitted e-mail is received at e-mail system 130 by an SMTP server 140 (col.2, lines 11-12). An HTML converter facility 158 included in the e-mail system 130 converts the e-mail message to an appropriate format (col.2, lines 30-36). E-mail recipient 106 sends a command to the e-mail system 130 via e-mail front end 150 to request the e-mail message from the e-mail system 130 (col.2, lines 22-30).

Applicants submit that CHEN does not disclose (or suggest) a communication control apparatus which includes a first communicator that is connected to a network, the first communicator being a component of the communication control apparatus, and a second communicator that is connected

to an Internet facsimile apparatus, the second communicator being a component of the communication control apparatus.

Regarding a first communicator, the recitation portion recited by the Examiner (col. lines 35-36) describes the HTML converter facility 158. On the other hand, regarding a second communicator, the recitation portion recited by the Examiner (col.1, lines 56-61) describes e-mail sender 102 and e-mail front end 108. Applicants submit that the HTML converter facility 158 of CHEN is clearly distinct from the e-mail sender 102 and the e-mail front end 108 (see, for example, Fig.1). Thus, Applicants submit that CHEN does not disclose (or suggest) Applicants' communication control apparatus in which a first communicator is connected to a network, the first communicator being a component of the communication control apparatus, and a second communicator is connected to an Internet facsimile apparatus, the second communicator being a component of the communication control apparatus.

Thus, Applicants submit that the claims 7, 8, and 11 are clearly distinct from CHEN.

Further, Applicants submit (and the Examiner acknowledged in the Official Action mailed on July 25, 2005) that CHAN does not disclose a controller which converts the e-mail address of the recipient into URL data. For this reason, Applicants submit that CHAN fails to disclose a controller that transmits HTML data to the recipient, based on URL data, as taught by the present invention. Rather, as noted above, in CHEN, e-mail recipient 106 sends a command to e-mail system 130 to retrieve the e-mail message from e-mail system 130 (col.2,

lines 22-30). In other words, e-mail recipient 106 of CHEN utilizes a command to request the e-mail message from e-mail system 130, but the HTML converter facility 158 does not utilize URL data to transmit the e-mail message to e-mail recipient 106. Therefore, Applicants submit that there are no suggestions about converting the e-mail address of the recipient into URL data, in CHEN. On the other hand, the present invention transmits, to the recipient via the first communicator, HTML data without intervention of the recipient, based on URL data.

Thus, Applicants submit that claims 7, 8, and 11 are clearly distinct from CHEN.

Applicants additionally submit that TOYODA fails to disclose that which is lacking in CHEN. TOYODA relates to an Internet facsimile apparatus. However, Applicants submit that TOYODA merely discloses the Internet facsimile apparatus itself. That is, TOYODA does not disclose a communication control apparatus which includes at least 1) a first communicator that is connected to a network, the first communicator being a component of the communication control apparatus, 2) a second communicator that is connected to an Internet facsimile apparatus, the Internet facsimile apparatus scanning image data and transmitting, to a recipient via the communication control apparatus, an e-mail to which the image data is attached, the second communicator being a component of the communication control apparatus, 3) a controller that converts the e-mail address of the recipient into URL data, and 4) a controller that transmits to the

recipient, via the first communicator, HTML data without intervention of the recipient, based on URL data according to a HTTP protocol.

Thus, Applicants submit that even if one attempted to combine the teachings of CHEN and TOYODA in the manner suggested by the Examiner, one would fail to arrive at the instant invention, as defined by pending claims 7, 8, and 11, as such a combination would fail to at least provide 1) a first communicator that is connected to a network, the first communicator being a component of the communication control apparatus, 2) a second communicator that is connected to an Internet facsimile apparatus, the Internet facsimile apparatus scanning image data and transmitting, to a recipient via the communication control apparatus, an e-mail to which the image data is attached, the second communicator being a component of the communication control apparatus, 3) a controller that converts the e-mail address of the recipient into URL data, and 4) a controller that transmits to the recipient, via the first communicator, HTML data without intervention of the recipient, based on URL data according to a HTTP protocol.

Further, Applicants submit that BEER et al. fail to disclose that which is lacking in CHEN and TOYODA. BEER et al. relate to a URL login system for fetching objects from various locations on a network, using a URL instead of a specific home directory. BEER et al. disclose a simple translation rule to compute a URL from an e-mail address (col.4, lines 5-30).

However, Applicants submit that BEER et al. do not disclose (or suggest) a second communicator which is connected to an Internet facsimile apparatus,

the communication control apparatus being distinct from the Internet facsimile, since BEER et al. do not contain any disclosure with respect to an Internet facsimile apparatus.

Applicants further submit that BEER et al. also do not disclose a controller which receives, from the Internet facsimile apparatus via the second communicator, an e-mail address of the recipient according to a SMTP protocol, since BEER et al. do not contain any disclosure with respect to a communication control apparatus connected to an Internet facsimile apparatus. Rather, in BEER et al., a user enters, by hand, an e-mail address into a Login Manager 3, which runs on a user system 5, and the Login Manager 3 determines a URL corresponding to the e-mail (col. 3, lines 66-67 and col. 4, lines 1-2). On the other hand, the communication control apparatus of Applicants' present invention is distinct from an Internet facsimile apparatus.

Further, BEER et al. do not disclose a controller which receives, from the receiving Internet facsimile apparatus via the second communicator, e-mail data directed to the recipient according to the SMTP protocol, converts the received e-mail data into HTML data, and transmits, to the recipient via the first communicator, HTML data, based on URL data according to a HTTP protocol, since BEER et al. do not contain any disclosure with respect to the claimed controller. Rather, in BEER et al. a user system 5 fetches, for example from server A, login object referred by URL (col.4, lines 41-49 and Fig.2 STEP 104). In other words, in BEER et al., a user at the receiving side must take an affirmative action. On the other hands, a communication control apparatus of the

present invention transmits to the recipient, via the first communicator, HTML data without intervention (action) of the recipient, based on URL data.

Thus, Applicants submit that even if one attempted to combine the teachings of CHEN, TOYODA, and BEER et al. in the manner suggested by the Examiner, one would fail to arrive at the instant invention, as defined by amended claims 7, 8, and 11, as such a combination would fail to at least provide 1) a second communicator that is connected to an Internet facsimile apparatus, the Internet facsimile apparatus scanning image data and transmitting, to a recipient via the communication control apparatus, an e-mail to which the image data is attached, the second communicator being a component of the communication control apparatus, and 2) a controller that transmits to the recipient, via the first communicator, HTML data without intervention of the recipient, based on URL data according to a HTTP protocol.

Therefore, Applicants submit that the amended claims are not obvious in view of the applied art of record, and respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection, and an indication of allowability of claims 7, 8, and 11. Claims 7, 8, and 11 are also submitted to be patentable over the Examiner's proposed combination, since the combination of CHEN, TOYODA, and BEER et al. does not disclose the combination of the features recited in Applicants' claims 7, 8, and 11.

Moreover, Applicants submit that the Examiner has not set forth a proper motivation for modifying CHEN and BEER et al. so as to transmit to the recipient HTML data without intervention of the recipient, based on URL data. In TADA, e-

mail recipient 106 accesses the e-mail message by sending a command to e-mail system 130 and requests the e-mail message from e-mail system 130 (col.2, lines 21-30). In other words, in CHEN, e-mail recipient 106 at the receiving side sends a command to receive the e-mail message from e-mail system 130. Similarly, In BEER et al., the user system 5 at the receiving side attempts to fetch login objects from a server takes action. Further, BEER et al. merely disclose a simple translation rule to compute a URL from an e-mail address.

With respect to the rejection of claims 9, 10, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), Applicants submit that TADA relates to a method and apparatus for processing e-mail with only a WWW browser. In TADA, the user terminal apparatus 14 transmits a WWW service request to Internet service provider 12 (col.5, lines 59-63 and Fig.8, S201). The Internet service provider 12 transmits a request for e-mail service to the user's e-mail service provider apparatus 16 (col.6, lines 5-9 and Fig.8, S205). The Internet service provider 12 receives, from the user's e-mail service provider apparatus 16, e-mail addressed to the user (col.6, lines 10-12 and Fig.8, S207). The Internet service provider 12 converts the user 's e-mail into HTML data (col.6, lines 12-13 and Fig.8, 208). The user terminal apparatus 14 transmits, to WWW-added service provider apparatus 43, which is included in the Internet service provider 12, a request for an e-mail HTML file (col.6, lines 33-38 and Fig.10, S401). The WWW-added service provider apparatus 43 returns the requested user e-mail HTML file to the user terminal apparatus 14 (col.6, lines 38-42 and Fig.10, S402).

However, Applicants submit that TADA does not disclose a second communicator which is connected to a receiving Internet facsimile apparatus, the receiving Internet facsimile apparatus receiving, from a transmitter via the communication control apparatus, an e-mail to which image data is attached and printing the image data attached to the received e-mail, since Fig. 3, which illustrates the user terminal apparatus 14, does not describe an Internet facsimile apparatus.

Applicants submit that TADA also does not disclose a controller which receives, from the transmitter via the first communicator, URL data according to a HTTP protocol. The recitation portion recited by the Examiner (col.7, lines 27-35) merely explains that the WWW-added service provider apparatus 43 included in the Internet service provider 12 receives the HTML-format e-mail data instead of receiving an e-mail and then transmits the received HTML-format e-mail data. In other words, the WWW-added service provider apparatus 43 of TADA receives the HTML-format e-mail data, but does not receive URL data. Thus, Applicants submit that TADA does not disclose a controller which receives, from the transmitter via the first communicator, URL data according to a HTTP protocol.

Further, TADA does not disclose a controller which converts the received URL data into an e-mail address of the receiving Internet facsimile apparatus. The recitation portion (col.7, lines 27-35) merely explains that the WWW-added service provider apparatus 43 included in the Internet service provider 12 receives the HTML-format e-mail data instead of receiving an e-mail and then

transmits the received HTML-format e-mail data. In other words, the WWW-added service provider apparatus 43 transmits the same HTML-format e-mail data as the WWW-added service provider apparatus 43 received. Thus, TODA fails to disclose a controller which converts the received URL data into an e-mail address of the receiving Internet facsimile apparatus. Additionally, the user terminal apparatus 14 transmits, to WWW-added service provider apparatus 43, a request for an e-mail HTML file (col.6, lines 33-38 and Fig.10, S401). The recitation portion (col.7, lines 27-35) does not change this feature of TODA. Thus, Applicants submit that there are no suggestions in TODA about converting the received URL data into the e-mail address of the recipient.

Furthermore, Applicants submit that TODA does not disclose a controller which transmits to the receiving Internet facsimile apparatus, via the second communicator, the e-mail data without intervention of a user of the receiving Internet facsimile apparatus, based on the e-mail address according to a SMTP protocol, as TODA does not provide any disclosure regarding converting the received URL data into an e-mail address of the receiving Internet facsimile apparatus, as noted above. Rather, in TODA, the user terminal apparatus 14 transmits a request for an e-mail HTML file to the WWW-added service provider apparatus 43 which is included in the Internet service provider 12 (col.6, lines 33-38 and Fig.10, S401). In other words, in TODA, a user of the user terminal apparatus 14 must initiate an action to receive the user e-mail HTML file from the WWW-added service provider apparatus 43. On the other hand, a communication control apparatus of the present invention transmits the e-mail

data to the receiving Internet facsimile apparatus without any intervention (action) of a user of the receiving Internet facsimile apparatus, based on the e-mail address.

Thus, Applicants submit that pending claims 9, 10, and 12 are clearly distinguished over TODA.

Applicants additionally submit that TOYODA fails to disclose that which is lacking in TADA. TOYODA relates to an Internet facsimile apparatus. However, Applicants submit that TOYODA merely disclose the Internet facsimile apparatus itself. That is, TOYODA does not disclose a communication control apparatus which includes at least 1) a second communicator that is connected to a receiving Internet facsimile apparatus, the receiving Internet facsimile apparatus receiving, from a transmitter via the communication control apparatus, an e-mail to which image data is attached and printing the image data attached to the received e-mail, 2) a controller that receives, from the transmitter via the first communicator, URL data according to a HTTP protocol, 3) a controller that converts the received URL data into an e-mail address of the receiving Internet facsimile apparatus, and 4) a controller that transmits to the receiving Internet facsimile apparatus, via the second communicator, the e-mail data without any intervention of a user of the receiving Internet facsimile apparatus, based on the e-mail address according to a SMTP protocol.

Thus, Applicants submit that even if one attempted to combine the teachings of TADA and TOYODA in the manner suggested by the Examiner, one would fail to arrive at the instant invention, as defined by pending claims 9, 10,

and 12, as such a combination would fail to provide a communication control apparatus which includes at least 1) a second communicator which is connected to a receiving Internet facsimile apparatus, the receiving Internet facsimile apparatus receiving, from a transmitter via the communication control apparatus, an e-mail to which image data is attached and printing the image data attached to the received e-mail, 2) a controller which receives, from the transmitter via the first communicator, URL data according to a HTTP protocol, 3) a controller which converts the received URL data into an e-mail address of the receiving Internet facsimile apparatus, and 4) a controller which transmits to the receiving Internet facsimile apparatus, via the second communicator, the e-mail data without any intervention of a user of the receiving Internet facsimile apparatus, based on the e-mail address according to a SMTP protocol.

Further, Applicants submit that BEER et al. fail to disclose that which is lacking in TADA. Applicants submit that BEER et al. do not disclose a second communicator which is connected to a receiving Internet facsimile apparatus, since BEER et al. do not contain any disclosure with respect to an Internet facsimile apparatus.

Further, Applicants submit that BEER et al. do not disclose a controller which receives, from the transmitter via the first communicator, URL data according to a HTTP protocol. Rather, BEER et al. disclose that a user enters, by hand, an e-mail address into a Login Manager 3, which runs on a user system 5, and the Login Manager 3 determines a URL corresponding to the e-mail (col. 3, lines 66-67 and col. 4, lines 1-2).

Further, BEER et al. do not disclose a controller which converts HTML data into an e-mail address of the receiving Internet facsimile apparatus. Rather, it is submitted that BEER et al. merely teach computing a URL from an e-mail address (col.4, lines 5-9).

Further, BEER et al. do not disclose a controller which transmits, to the receiving Internet facsimile apparatus via the second communicator, the e-mail data without intervention of a user of the receiving Internet facsimile apparatus, based on the e-mail address according to a SMTP protocol, since BEER et al. do not teach converting HTML data into e-mail data of the receiving Internet facsimile apparatus. Rather, in BEER et al. the user system 5 fetches, from server A, login object referred by URL (col.4, lines 41-49 and Fig.2 STEP 104). In other words, the user system 5 must take an action to fetch login objects from a server. On the other hand, a communication control apparatus of the present invention transmits, to the receiving Internet facsimile apparatus, the e-mail data without intervention of a user of the receiving Internet facsimile apparatus, based on the e-mail address.

Thus, Applicants submit that even if one attempted to combine the teachings of TADA, TOYODA, and BEER et al. in the manner suggested by the Examiner, one would fail to arrive at the instant invention, as defined by amended claims 9, 10 and 12, as such a combination would fail to provide a communication control apparatus which includes at least 1) a second communicator which is connected to a receiving Internet facsimile apparatus, the receiving Internet facsimile apparatus receiving, from a transmitter via the

communication control apparatus, an e-mail to which image data is attached and printing the image data attached to the received e-mail, 2) a controller which receives, from the transmitter via the first communicator, URL data according to a HTTP protocol, 3) a controller which converts the received URL data into an e-mail address of the receiving Internet facsimile apparatus, and 4) a controller which transmits to the receiving Internet facsimile apparatus, via the second communicator, the e-mail data without intervention of a user of the receiving Internet facsimile apparatus, based on the e-mail address according to a SMTP protocol.

Therefore, Applicants submit that the amended claims are not obvious in view of the applied art of record, and respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection, and an indication of allowability of claims 9, 10, and 12. Pending claims 9, 10, and 12 are also submitted to be patentable over the Examiner's proposed combination, since the combination of TADA, TOYADA, and BEER et al. fail to disclose the combination of the features recited in Applicant's claims 9, 10, and 12.

Moreover, Applicants submit that the Examiner has not set forth a proper motivation for modifying TADA and BEER et al. so as to transmit, to the receiving Internet facsimile apparatus, the converted e-mail data without intervention of a user of the receiving Internet facsimile apparatus, based on the converted e-mail address. In TADA, the Internet service provider 12 does not receive, from the user's e-mail service provider apparatus 16 which transmits e-mail to the Internet service provider 12, an e-mail address of the user terminal apparatus 14. Rather,

in TADA, the Internet service provider 12 returns the e-mail HTML file to the user terminal apparatus 14, in response to a request from the user terminal apparatus 14 (col.5, lines 35-41). In other words, the user terminal apparatus 14 at the receiving side must transmit a request to receive the e-mail HTML file from the Internet service provider 12. Similarly, in BEER et al., the user system 5 at the receiving side attempts to fetch login objects from a server. Further, BEER et al. merely disclose a simple translation rule to compute a URL from an e-mail address.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding objection and rejections, and an indication of the allowability of all the claims pending in the present application in due course.

Although the status of the application is after final rejection, Applicants submit that entry of the amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. In particular, Applicants submit that the amended claims place the application in condition for allowance, or alternatively, the amended claims place the application in better condition for purposes of appeal. Further, the amendment does not add any additional claims, and no new issues are presented that would require a further search. Accordingly, entry of the present amendment is respectfully requested.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION


Applicants have made a sincere effort to place the present application in condition for allowance and believe that they has now done so. Applicants have amended the rejected claims for consideration by the Examiner. With respect to the pending claims, Applicants have pointed out the features thereof and have contrasted the features of the new claims with the disclosures of the references. Accordingly, Applicants have provided a clear evidentiary basis supporting the patentability of all claims in the present application and respectfully requests an indication of the allowability of all the claims pending in the present application in due course.

Should an extension of time be necessary to maintain the pendency of this application, including any extensions of time required to place the application in condition for allowance by an Examiner's Amendment, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fee to Deposit Account No. 19-0089.

The amendments to the claims which have been made in this amendment, and which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

Should the Examiner have any questions or comments regarding this Response, or the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,
Masao AKIMOTO et al.



Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027

August 11, 2005
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191

Steven Wegman
Reg. No. 31,438